IJDIAS International Journal of Discoveries and Innovations in Applied Sciences

| e-ISSN: 2792-3983 | www.openaccessjournals.eu | Volume: 2 Issue: 6

Typological Studies and Factors of Single Sentences in Russian and Uzbek Languages

Tulaeva Dilshoda Nurullaevna
1st year Master student of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

In this article, we consider the classification of single-component sentences by factors. The classification of one-component sentences by factors is more convenient and scientifically substantiated, since the classification is carried out sequentially and according to one common basis. In addition, such a classification allows us to introduce the concept of typological equivalent into typology. This article also considers four factors of one-component sentences in Russian and Uzbek languages. The following factors of one-component sentences (OP) were identified: contextual speech factor, communicative and informative factor, lexico-structural factor, morphological and constructive factor.

Keywords: typological research, inaccessibility by the grammatical structure of the sentence, factors of one-component, marking, non-marking, the meaning of a person, number.

I. Introduction.

A typological study of one-part sentences in the Russian and Uzbek languages allows us to conclude that the one-part sentence is typologically inherent in both languages, although it is common in each of them in different ways. The ontology of one-part is proved by the close relationship of one-part with "impersonal" words in Russian and with the peculiarities of the passive voice and passive constructions in the Uzbek language.

A typological study of the features of one-component sentences in languages of different systems clearly shows that the subject, in cases where its person / number is clearly marked in the morphological composition of the predicate, is an optional and even redundant component of the surface structural organization of the sentence in both languages. The absence / presence of such a subject does not affect the structure of the sentence, therefore the absence of a subject serves as a criterion for a one-part sentence structure.

II. Discussion and results.

One-part sentences are those that do not presuppose a subject and do not allow it. Therefore, one-part sentences are those that consist only of the composition of the predicate and do not allow a subject. Therefore, firstly, one-partness is closely associated with the morphological design of the predicate, and it is not advisable to consider morphologically unformed types of sentences as one-part sentences (i.e. words - sentences, appeals, names, etc.), and secondly, the division of one-part sentences into "subjects" and "predicates" are wrong. - One-part sentences are formed and grammatically arranged around one single center - the predicate, because the paradigm of forms of tenses, accumulations, affirmation / negation and modalities inherent in SS (single-compound sentences) is characteristic of the predicate, and not the subject. Hence, all nominative sentences should be evaluated as predicative.

The criteria we have indicated allow us to evaluate all types of so-called. "Personal" (definitely personal, generalized personal, indefinitely personal) one-part sentences should be considered as

contextual-stylistic speech variants of two-part sentences, or what is the same, as incomplete variants of the implementation of two-component subject-predicative structural schemes. The "single composition" of such sentences is determined not structurally - grammatically, but contextually - stylistically. The fact that the so-called. “Personal” SSes do not have a proper linguistic structure nature, proves the fact that the functioning of such sentences depends on such factors as:

a) marked / unmarked meaning of the person / number of the subject in the morphological structure of the predicate;

b) the presence/absence of an underline of the action producer;

c) stylistic goals for determining the direction (correlation) of an action (state) to a specific person or a generalized one.

All these metalinguistic factors are common to both languages, which is the reason for the large interlingual commonalities in the structure and functioning of “personal” SSes in the compared two, heterosystem languages.

When eliminating from the composition of one-part proposals, the so-called. “Personal” types, all one-component sentences in both languages acquire a common semantic core - a statement of the state (existing, given or for another action / state). It is with this that a large degree of spread of the functioning of one-component sentences with negation in the Russian language can be associated, because. when stating the absence (negation), the meaning of the state is much stronger, more distinct than when affirming.

The general semantics of the present state is most clearly manifested in the nominative sentences of both languages, which serve for the linguistic designation and expression of illusory beingness. Nominative sentences in both languages are the only linguistic means of expressing such information and metalinguistic reality. Significant, one might even say complete, parallelism in the structure and functioning of nominative sentences in the Russian and Uzbek languages is motivated precisely by this - the metalinguistic factor of the motivation of these sentences in both languages. In addition, they clearly prove that one-composition is ontologically inherent in these languages. One-component in the Russian language is very developed and is supported by the division of Russian words into "личные" ("personal") - in the position of the predicate, combining with the subject in Im.p. - and "безличные" ("personal") - in the position of the predicate, not combined with the subject in Im.p., which is unusual for the Uzbek language. That is why the lexical-structurally conditioned one-part sentences of the Russian language in Uzbek speech are transmitted mainly by two-part sentences. The lexical-structurally conditioned one-component structure, which is very developed in the Russian language, had an interfering effect on the Uzbek language, which manifested itself:

a) in expanding the scope of functioning of constructions of the type;

b) at the beginning of the formation of impersonal meanings and functionings in a number of words and word forms;

c) at the beginning of isolation and semantically functional separation of words like *zarur*, *kerak*, *lozim*, etc.

In the Russian language, where the lexical-structurally conditioned one-composition is very developed, the morphological-structurally conditioned one-component is poorly developed. In the Uzbek language, on the contrary, morphologically conditioned one-component structure is quite strongly developed. As a means of expressing morphological one-composition, the Uzbek language

ISSN 2792-3983 (online), Published under Volume: 2 Issue: 6 in Jun-2022

widely uses the possibilities of the passive voice, absolutizing the meaning of eliminating the active producer of the action to impersonality and subjectlessness, which is most clearly manifested in the */Vfpass in/ and /N4 Vfpass tr/* models, as well as special analytical constructions with the auxiliary verb bo' lmoq and words like *kerak, zarur*. Cases in the Uzbek language, as a means of designing a morphologically determined one-component, function inactively. In contrast to this, in Russian, indirect cases are the most powerful means of expressing morphologically determined one-component, which is most pronounced in correlative constructions such as *Народ собрался./ Народу собралось. Видна гора /Видно гору*, etc.

To express the morphologically conditioned one-composition, the Russian language also uses the possibilities of the passive voice - mainly passive participles. However, the latter very quickly fall into the sphere of predicatives, closely adjoining to them, are lexicalized, replenishing the arsenal of these words.

Comparative - typological analysis of one-part sentences in Russian and Uzbek languages allows one to take a step forward in the classification of one-part sentences in these languages. Our observations have shown the correctness of the hypothesis put before the work that, in addition to semantic and informative-expressive goals, the single-component sentence is determined by special factors. We were able to identify four such factors:

1) **contextual-speech factor,** when the implementation of the structural scheme is incomplete, the omission in speech of a certain mandatory or possible part of the sentence is determined by contextual, stylistic goals;

2) **a communicative-informative factor,** when a single-component construction is the only language means for the design, transmission and preservation of any kind of information;

3) **lexical-structural factor,** when there are special words in the lexical arsenal of the language, which, being realized in the position of the predicate, do not have the semantic-syntactic valence of the combination with the Im.p. determine the one-part (non-nominative) sentence;

4) **morphological - a constructive factor,** when the special forms of the predicate or subject, the potential subject, and the special constructions formed by them exclude the presence of the subject in the Im.p. in the sentence structure.

Our observations have shown that all types of single-component sentences identified by researchers of the Russian and Uzbek languages can be distributed without a trace, classified according to these factors.

III. Conclusion.

The classification of one-component sentences according to these factors is more convenient and scientifically substantiated, since the classification is carried out sequentially and according to one common basis. Such a classification is more informative than the traditional semantic-lexical-morphological one, based on different criteria. In addition, such a classification makes it possible to develop more effective methods of presenting and explaining the features of one-component sentences of each of the specific languages in a foreign language audience. In addition, such a classification allows us to introduce the concept of typological equivalent into typology. The typological equivalent is understood as functionally significant, equivalent structurally identical or different phenomena of two or more languages at the level of the norm. The concept of a typological equivalent will make it possible in the future to create and widely introduce into the practice of teaching non-native languages special dictionaries of syntactic structures and typological equivalents.

ISSN 2792-3983 (online), Published under Volume: 2 Issue: 6 in Jun-2022

| e-ISSN: 2792-3983 | www.openaccessjournals.eu | Volume: 2 Issue: 6

References:

1. Бабайцева В. В. Односоставные предложения в современном русском языке. — М.: Просвещение, 1968. — 160 с.
2. Бабайцева В. В. Система односоставных предложений в современном русском языке. – М., 2004.
3. Потебня А. А. Предикативность существительного. Устранение подлежащего [Текст]: научное издание / А.А. Потебня. - М.: Красанд, 2010. - 140 с.
4. Саидова М.Р. Односоставность. Аспекты грамматические и логические // Первые Бухарские философские чтения. – Бухара, 1992. – с. 70-72.
5. Sayfullayeva R., AbduzalovaM. Gapning eng kichik ko'rinish qoliplari haqida // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. -1991. - №5. – b. 42-47.
6. Pirimovich E. H. ALISHER NAVOI'S ARTISTIC SKILLS IN THE USE OF WORDS REPEAT AND RHYTHM //湖南大学学报 (自然科学版). – 2021. – Т. 48. – №. 12.
7. EŞONKULOV H. ALI ŞİİR NEVAÎ'NİN MAHBUBU'L-KULUB ESERİ VE ŞAİRİN AŞIKÂNE GAZELLERİNDE ÂŞK KONUSU //Electronic Turkish Studies. – 2018. – Т. 13. – №. 20.
8. Рустамова Г. ХАЛҚ ҚЎШИҚЛАРИДА АНОР ПОЭТИК ОБРАЗИНИНГ БАДИИЙ ИФОДАСИ //Научно-практическая конференция. – 2022.
9. Uraeva D., Kabulova Z. INFLUENCE OF UZBEK LITERATURE ON ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF KARAKALPAK MODERN POETRY //КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, ИСКУССТВОВЕДЕНИЕ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ И НАУЧНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ. – 2019. – С. 94-98.
10. Ураева Д. С. и др. ВЫРАЖЕНИЕ ВЕРЫ В ОГОНЬ И ЗОЛУ В ВОЛШЕБНОЕ ИСЦЕЛЕНИЕ НА НАРОДНЫХ ПЕСНЯХ //European Scientific Conference. – 2020. – С. 360-363.

ISSN 2792-3983 (online), Published under Volume: 2 Issue: 6 in Jun-2022